



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/487,932	01/20/2000	Richard Alan Fiedotin	061018-0007US	3747
24341 7590 02/14/2008 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS, LLP. 2 PALO ALTO SQUARE 3000 EL CAMINO REAL PALO ALTO, CA 94306				
EXAMINER COBANOGILU, DILEK B				
ART UNIT 3626		PAPER NUMBER		
MAIL DATE 02/14/2008		DELIVERY MODE PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/487,932

Applicant(s)

FIEDOTIN ET AL.

Examiner

DILEK B. COBANOGU

Art Unit

3626

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 November 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 45-66 and 89-91 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 45-66 and 89-91 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/C)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 4/11/2001, 11/21/2007

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is in response to the amendment received on 11/21/2007.

Claims 45-66 and 89-91 remain pending in this application.

Claim Objections

2. Objection of claim 45 have been withdrawn in light of the amendment made to this claim.

Specification

3. The new matter rejection and 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph rejection to claim 45 have been withdrawn in light of the amendments made to this claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 45-61, 63, 64, 66 and 89-91 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falchuk et al, (hereinafter Falchuk) (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,613), Bauer et al. (hereinafter Bauer) (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,325) and further in view of Pang (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,007 B1).

A. Claim 45 is amended now to recite a method for distributing medical information stored on a computer system to a group of physicians (Falchuk; abstract, col. 2, lines 11-21), the method comprising:

- i. At a server in said computer system:
 - (1) identifying a group of physicians from multiple physicians (Falchuk; col. 3, lines 11-46);
 - (2) generating an interactive message comprising: customizing at least a portion of said medical information stored on the computer system to said identified group (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 35-47, col. 6, lines 11-17); and including objects that physicians in the group can select to respond to, or dispose of, the interactive message;
 - (3) receiving, at the server, a synchronization signal from a respective handheld computing device operated by a respective physician of the group of physicians, wherein said synchronization signal indicates an availability of said respective handheld computing device for receipt of said interactive message; and
 - (4) in response to said synchronization signal, automatically transmitting said interactive message from the computer system to said respective handheld computing device.
- Falchuk fails to expressly teach receiving, at the server, a synchronization signal from a respective handheld computing device. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Bauer.

In particular, Bauer discloses receiving, at the server, a synchronization signal from a respective handheld computing device (Bauer; abstract, col. 1, line 59 to col. 2, line 5, col. 3, lines 1-11, col. 6, lines 13-21, col. 11, lines 17-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Bauer with the motivation of reduce the communication costs (Bauer; col. 1, lines 51-58).

- Falchuk does not explicitly disclose interactive message comprising: including objects that the physicians (or users) can select to respond to, or dispose of, the interactive message. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Pang.

In particular, Pang discloses interactive message comprising: including objects that the physicians (or users) can select to respond to, or dispose of, the interactive message (Pang; col. 3, lines 19-62, figure 5, items 514, 519).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Pang with the motivation of users will be able to define custom actions and assign such actions to custom icons for display

on the e-mail (interactive messaging) system (Pang; col. 6, lines 58-62).

- Falchuk fails to expressly teach receiving, at the server, a synchronization signal from a respective handheld computing device, wherein said synchronization signal indicates an availability of said respective handheld computing device for receipt of said interactive message. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Bauer.

In particular, Bauer discloses receiving, at the server, a synchronization signal from a respective handheld computing device, wherein said synchronization signal indicates an availability of said respective handheld computing device for receipt of said interactive message (Bauer; col. 1, lines 51-58, col. 3, lines 1-11, col. 6, lines 13-21, col. 11, lines 17-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Bauer with the motivation of synchronize the data in the central database with the data on each client's computer (Bauer; col. 1, line 59 to col. 2, lines 5).

B. Claim 46 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, wherein said identifying is based on information selected from the group consisting of: a practice area of each respective physician of the group of physicians; a number

of prescriptions written by each respective physician; a Drug Enforcement Agency number of each respective physician, a medical education number of each respective physician, and or any combination of the aforementioned (Falchuk; col. 3, lines 47-52 and col. 5, lines 48-54).

C. Claim 47 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, wherein said identifying is based on a medical education number of each respective physician of said group of physicians (Falchuk; col. 3, lines 47-52 and col. 5, lines 48-54).

D. Claim 48 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, further comprising, after said identifying, examining respective profiles of each respective physician of the group of physicians, wherein said interactive message is customized based on said respective profiles (Falchuk; col. 6, lines 1-10).

E. Claim 49 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, wherein the interactive message includes an interactive question directed to the physicians in the group. (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 35-47).

F. Claim 50 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, wherein the interactive message includes a question asking respective physician of the group of physicians if the respective physicians would like further information on a certain medical topic (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 35-47).

G. As per claim 51, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 45, wherein the interactive message includes an inquiry whether said physicians wishes to receive Continuing Medical Education (CME) (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 48-58).

H. As per claim 52, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 51, wherein the Continuing Medical Education includes educational materials or multiple choice exams (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 48-58).

I. Claim 53 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, further comprising, after said transmitting, receiving a response from said respective physician of said group of physicians (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 35-47).

J. Claim 54 is amended now to recite the method of claim 53, further comprising, sending further medical information to said respective physician of the group of physicians based on said response (Falchuk; col. 6, lines 10-27).

K. Claim 55 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, wherein the interactive message includes an inquiry whether said physicians wish to receive Continuing Medical Education (CME) (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 48-58), and said method further comprises, after said transmitting, receiving a response from said respective physician of said group of physicians and transmitting CME educational materials or multiple choice exams to said respective computing device operated by said respective physician of said identified group of physicians if said response indicated that said respective physician of said group of physicians wishes to receive Continuing Medical Education (CME) (Falchuk; col. 5, lines 48-67).

- Also, the obviousness of modifying the teaching of Falchuk to include transmitting said interactive message from the computer system to said respective handheld computing device (as taught by

Bauer) is as addressed above in the rejection of claim 45 and incorporated herein.

L. As per claim 56, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 45, wherein said generating further comprises associating an expiration date with said interactive message expires after a predetermined time (Falchuk; col. 4, lines 53-61).

M. As per claim 57, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 45, wherein said generating further comprises associating an expiration date with said interactive message, such that said interactive message expires after a predetermined time and is thereafter removed (Falchuk; col. 4, lines 53-61).

- The obviousness of modifying the teaching of Falchuk to include transmitting said interactive message from the computer system to said respective handheld computing device (as taught by Bauer) is as addressed above in the rejection of claim 45 and incorporated herein.

N. Claim 58 is amended now to recite the method of claim 45, wherein said interactive message is configured to be automatically displayed to said respective physician of said identified group of physicians (Falchuk; col. 6, lines 24-27, lines 28-43) once downloaded to said respective handheld computing device.

- Also, the obviousness of modifying the teaching of Falchuk to include transmitting said interactive message from the computer system to said respective handheld computing device (as taught by

Bauer) is as addressed above in the rejection of claim 45 and incorporated herein.

O. As per claim 59, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 45, wherein said receiving further comprises receiving, from said respective handheld computing device, an amount of interactive messages stored on said respective handheld computing device; and if said amount is above a maximum amount, storing said interactive message on the server instead of transmitting said interactive message to said respective handheld computing device.

Falchuk explicitly fails to disclose an amount of interactive messages stored on said respective handheld computing device; and if said amount is above a maximum amount, storing said interactive message on the server instead of transmitting said interactive message to said respective handheld computing device. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Bauer.

In particular, Bauer discloses an amount of interactive messages stored on said respective handheld computing device; and if said amount is above a maximum amount, storing said interactive message on the server instead of transmitting said interactive message to said respective handheld computing device (Bauer; col. 1, lines 51-58, col. 3, lines 1-11, col. 6, lines 13-21, col. 11, lines 17-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed

by Bauer with the motivation of synchronize the data in the central database with the data on each client's computer (Bauer; col. 1, line 59 to col. 2, lines 5).

P. As per claim 60, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 45, further comprising repeating said generating and transmitting steps for multiple interactive messages (Falchuk; col. 3, lines 27-31).

Q. As per claim 61 Falchuk discloses the method of claim 45.

Falchuk explicitly fails to disclose respective handheld computing device configured to store a set maximum amount of messages at any one time. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Bauer. In particular, Bauer discloses respective handheld computing device configured to store a set maximum amount of messages at any one time (Bauer; col. 1, lines 51-58, col. 3, lines 1-11, col. 4, lines 12-25, col. 6, lines 13-21, col. 11, lines 17-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Bauer with the motivation of synchronize the data in the central database with the data on each client's computer (Bauer; col. 1, line 59 to col. 2, lines 5).

R. As per claim 63 Falchuk discloses the method of claim 45, further comprising:

- i. storing medical data in a database on the server (Falchuk; col. 2, lines 38-46, col. 3, lines 12-46); and

ii. communicating at least some of said medical data from said database to said respective handheld computing device in response to a connection signal received from said respective handheld computing device.

- Falchuk fails to expressly teach communicating at least some of said medical data from said database to said respective handheld computing device in response to a connection signal received from said respective handheld computing device. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Bauer.

In particular, Bauer discloses communicating at least some of said medical data from said database to said respective handheld computing device in response to a connection signal received from said respective handheld computing device (Bauer; col. 1, lines 51-58, col. 3, lines 1-11, col. 6, lines 13-21, col. 11, lines 17-35).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Bauer with the motivation of synchronize the data in the central database with the data on each client's computer (Bauer; col. 1, line 59 to col. 2, lines 5).

S. As per claim 64, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 63, further comprising, before said storing, aggregating said medical data from multiple sources (Falchuk; col. 2, lines 22-46).

T. As per claim 65, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 63, wherein said communicating said medical data further comprises:

- i. receiving a request for medical data (Falchuk; col. 2, lines 11-21) from said respective handheld computing device;
- ii. responding to the request by sending at least a portion of said medical data (Falchuk; col. 2, lines 22-37) to said respective handheld computing device.

- The obviousness of modifying the teaching of Falchuk to include a handheld computing device (as taught by Bauer) is as addressed above in the rejection of claim 45 and incorporated herein.

U. Claim 89 has been amended now to recite the method of claim 48, wherein examining, for each physician of the identified group of physicians, count data, said count data recording access time and frequency, and input data, said input data tracking all input for each physician of identified group of physicians (Falchuk; col. 5, line 48 to col. 6, lines 10).

V. Newly added claim 91 recites the method of claim 45, including, after said transmitting, receiving, in response to a second synchronization signal, a selection of a negative response object or a positive response object in the interactive message, wherein the selection in one click on either the negative or response object or the positive response object.

Falchuk fails to expressly teach a selection of a negative response object or a positive response object in the interactive message, wherein the

selection in one click on either the negative or response object or the positive response object. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Bauer.

In particular, Pang discloses a selection of a negative response object or a positive response object in the interactive message, wherein the selection in one click on either the negative or response object or the positive response object (Pang; col. 3, lines 19-62, figure 5, items 514, 519).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Pang with the motivation of users will be able to define custom actions and assign such actions to custom icons for display on the e-mail (interactive messaging) system (Pang; col. 6, lines 58-62).

- The obviousness of modifying the teaching of Falchuk to include synchronization signal from the computer system to said respective handheld computing device (as taught by Bauer) is as addressed above in the rejection of claim 45 and incorporated herein.

6. Claim 62 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falchuk et al, (hereinafter Falchuk) (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,613), Bauer et al. (hereinafter Bauer) (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,325) Pang (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,007 B1) and further in view of Horvits (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,160 B1).

A. Claim 62 recites the method of claim 45, further comprising prioritizing the interactive message by a category selected from the group consisting of: an expiration date, importance, and urgency.

Falchuk fails to expressly teach prioritizing the interactive message by a category selected from the group consisting of: an expiration date, importance, and urgency. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Horvitz.

In particular, Horvitz discloses prioritizing the interactive message by a category selected from the group consisting of: an expiration date, importance, and urgency (Horvitz; abstract, col. 1, lines 58-63, col. 14, lines 41-57).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Horvitz with the motivation of making email (or interactive message) more useful in environments where a lot of emails is exchanged (Horvitz; col. 2, lines 3-5).

7. Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falchuk et al. (hereinafter Falchuk) (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,613), Wharton et al. (hereinafter Wharton) (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,664), Examiner's official notice and further in view of Edelson et al. (hereinafter Edelson) (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,539).

A. As per claim 65, Falchuk discloses the method of claim 64, wherein said aggregating step further comprises collecting

Falchuk fails to expressly teach medical data from a group consisting of: formulary data, pharmacopia data, and any combination of the aforementioned, per se, since it appears that Falchuk is more directed to a medical data consisting of medical journals, tutorials (Falchuk; col. 3, line 53-col. 4, line 3). However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Edelson.

In particular, Edelson discloses "medical data from a group consisting of: formulary data, pharmacopia data, and any combination of the aforementioned" (Edelson; col.8, lines 11-16).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Edelson with the motivation of permitting enhancement of the quality of prescribing decisions (Edelson; abstract).

8. Claim 90 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Falchuk et al, (hereinafter Falchuk) (U.S. Patent No. 6,256,613), Bauer et al. (hereinafter Bauer) (U.S. Patent No. 5,884,325) Pang (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,007 B1) Horvits (U.S. Patent No. 6,622,160 B1) and further in view of Wharton et a. (hereinafter Wharton) (U.S. Patent No. 5,831,664).

A. Claim 90 has been amended now to recite the method of claim 45, wherein the objects include answers each respective physician of the identified group of physicians can select without typing text.

- Falchuk fails to expressly teach objects include answers the physicians can select without typing text. However, this feature is well known in the art, as evidenced by Wharton.

In particular, Wharton discloses objects include answers the physicians can select without typing text (Wharton; col. 3, lines 55-63).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the aforementioned limitation as disclosed by Wharton with the motivation of user interacts with mobile interface device by touching control buttons (Wharton; col. 3, lines 55-63).

Response to Arguments

9. Applicant's arguments filed 11/21/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant's arguments will be addressed below in the order in which they appear.

A. In response to Applicant's argument about Falchuk does not teach "at a server in said computer system, identifying a group of physicians from multiple physicians", Examiner respectfully submits that Falchuk teaches "A supervisory computer 10 used in the preferred embodiment of the invention operates as illustrated in FIG. 1 to perform three principal concurrent functions: (1) it manages and records a consultation session between a primary care physician

and a selected specialist, both of whom are typically geographically remote from the host computer; (2) it both uses and augments a database of medical information which includes a collection of case study items, each containing information which was utilized during the course of a given consultation session; and (3) it builds and uses a database of "learning events" associated with each participating primary care physician, thereby creating reports for participating physicians which certify their participation in consultation sessions entitling them to continuing medical education credits." And "... The supervisory computer 10 is typically located remotely from the client computer 20 and serves a **large number of client computers** in client/server relationship" in col. 3, lines 12-46.

B. In response to Applicant's argument about Falchuk does not teach an inquiry whether said physician wishes to receive CME, Examiner respectfully submits that Falchuk teaches "an information database (40) advantageously includes a publication database 42 consisting of abstracts or the full text of articles in medical journals, either stored locally in the host processor's mass storage facility, or in an available medical database, such as Medline/Medlars, connected to the host supervisory processor 10 over a data communications network (not shown). In addition, the information database 40 further advantageously contains a **tutorial database 44 containing background lessons which will be made selectively available to the requesting physician** as an adjunct to, and in support of, the comments to be received from the specialist. The information database 40 further advantageously **contains a**

database 46 of approved protocols and practices which, to the extent applicable to the requested consultation, should be called to the attention of the requesting physician. Finally, the database 40 advantageously includes a case history database 48 which is augmented by case study data produced by the administered consultation sessions themselves, as hereinafter described." In col. 3, line 53 to col. 4, line 3. Therefore Falchuk teaches lessons (or CME) selectively available to the requesting physician, and approved protocols and practices (or CME) that are called to the attention of the requesting physician.

C. In response to Applicant's argument about Falchuk does not teach examining respective profiles of said identified physicians including examining count data and input data for each of the identified physicians, Examiner respectfully submits that Falchuk teaches "The accreditation module 70 administers a database 72 which records information concerning the consultation sessions and produces accreditation reports 75 which may be submitted to the responsible accreditation authority to certify that the requesting physician is entitled to continuing medical education (CME) credits based on his or her participation in the consultation session." (examining count data and input data for each physician) "When required for credit, the requesting physician may also be requested to complete an examination form testing the knowledge gained, in which case an examination is made available the requesting physician as indicated at 77. This examination form may also be advantageously implemented by an HTML form which is transmitted to the requesting physician, completed,

and resubmitted to the supervisory computer 10 as indicated at 79. The completed examination form is then graded and the results posted to the CME database 72 as indicated at 80. The credits accumulated by individual primary care physicians who have participated in learning sessions are then detailed in the CME credit report 75 which is thereafter produced for submission to the responsible accrediting body as indicated at 82." In col. 5, lines 48-67. Certifying that the requesting physician is entitled to continuing medical education (CME) credits based on his or her participation in the consultation session, is examining respective profiles of the physicians.

D. The Applicant's remaining arguments with respect to claims 45-66 and 89-90 with have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

11. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 3626

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to DILEK B. COBANOGLU whose telephone number is (571)272-8295. The examiner can normally be reached on 8-4:30.

13. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas can be reached on 571-272-6776. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

14. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/D. B. C./
Examiner, Art Unit 3626

/C. Luke Gilligan/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3626